



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,336	06/12/2001	Fujio Seki	122.1456	2145
21171 7590 05/21/2007 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER PICH, PONNOREAY	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/878,336

Applicant(s)

SEKI ET AL.

Examiner

Ponnoreay Pich

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-38 are pending.

Response to Amendment and Arguments

Applicant's amendments and arguments directed towards amended claims were fully considered. The arguments were not considered persuasive.

Applicant argues that as per claim 1, Beasley does not teach the limitation of "a connection unit that connects each terminal to **a corresponding private computer in a default status** and switches a connection destination of the terminal to **at least one private computer corresponding to at least one terminal** or the shared computer when a connection switching request transmitted from the at least one terminal has been received." Applicant states that the cited sections of Beasley do not teach "a corresponding private computer in a default status" or "a corresponding computer in a default status".

The examiner notes that claim 1 was rejected over Beasley in view of applicant's admittance of prior art (AAPA) and further in view of Nichols. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA, 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, it is true that Beasley alone does not teach a corresponding **private** computer in a default status. The computers attached to the switching device disclosed by Beasley were all shared computers. However, AAPA disclosed that it was well known in the prior art for computers attached to switching devices to consist of not just shared

Art Unit: 2135

computers as taught by Beasley, but also a private computer and a shared computer (page 2, lines 2-31). Further, a computer's status at any time could be considered a default status of the computer absent any further clarification in the claim of what would constitute the default status of a computer. Thus, when the teachings of both Beasley and AAPA are considered together as a whole, the examiner submits that the limitation under contention would have been obvious.

It would appear from applicant's arguments in the last paragraph on page 14 of remarks submitted that applicant is stating that the connection unit by default connects each terminal to a corresponding private computer. However, the examiner respectfully submits that the way applicant has worded the claim, more than just this interpretation can apply. The limitation under contention could also be read to mean that the connection unit connects each terminal to a corresponding private computer, the corresponding private computer is in a default status. In examining a claim, the broadest, reasonable interpretation of the claim must be considered and if more than one interpretation of the claim can apply, then the claim should be rejected using any interpretation anticipated by or rendered obvious by the prior art.

Applicant argues that Beasley teaches away from a corresponding first computer in a default status, thus there would be no motivation to combine the private computer of the AAPA with the switch of Beasley. This argument seems to stem from applicant's view that the only way to read the claim is the connection unit by default connecting the terminal to the private computer. However, as explained above, this is not the only way to interpret the claimed limitation and the status of any computer at any given time could

be considered a default status of the computer absent any further clarification in the claim of what should be considered a default status of a computer.

Applicant argues Beasley does not disclose "identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which a terminal is connected, the identification processing enciphering a received key code". Applicant argues that Beasley does not disclose use of an encryption key corresponding to the connector. However, the examiner respectfully notes that as currently recited (and for that matter as previously recited), the claims do not require use of an encryption key corresponding to the connector in enciphering of the key code. The claims only require identification processing which makes use of an identifier corresponding to a connector...and the identification processing enciphering a received key code. The claims do not limit how the enciphering is accomplished or in what manner the identifier is used in the enciphering process. The examiner assumes in light of the interview held between the examiner and applicant's representative and in light of remarks by applicant that applicant meant for the claims to state something more along the lines of "... the identification processing enciphering a received key code via use of the identifier as an encryption key".

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 37 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims are objected to because as explained above, applicant's amendments do not fully incorporate the proposed amendments discussed in the interview between the examiner and applicant's representative and based on

Art Unit: 2135

applicant's remarks, it appeared that this was an unintentional mistake. The examiner will assume applicant meant to instead state in the claims "... the identification processing enciphering a received key code via use of the identifier as an encryption key" as this was more along in line of what was discussed in the interview and more closely reflects what applicant is arguing. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 13-20, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley et al (US 5,721,842) in view of applicant's admittance of prior art (herein referred to as AAPA) and further in view of Rothenberg (US 5,432,850).

Claims 1 and 7:

As per claim 1, Beasley discloses:

1. A connecting unit (Fig 1, item 60) that connects each terminal to a corresponding first computer in a default status; and switches a connection destination of the terminal to the at least one first computer or the shared computer when a connection switching request transmitted from the at least one terminal has been received (col 2, lines 56-64). *Note that each of the computers 54, 55, and 56 in Figure 1 are accessible by any one of terminals/workstations 62, 64, and 66.*

Thus, any one of computers 54-56 can be considered the shared computer any computer not considered the shared computer is considered the first computer. Further, all the computers at any given time each have a status which could be considered a default status of the computer since the claim does not define what is considered to be a default status.

2. A security unit (Fig 2, CPU 80) that executes, for each terminal, identification processing of data that has been received from any one terminal and output the at least one first computer or the shared computer, the identification processing including utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the at least one terminal is connected (col 6, lines 42-54 and Figures 2B, item 122).

CPU 80 is disclosed as performing processing of data received from the keyboard, mouse, or monitor to form a packet as seen in Figure 2B for output to the destination computer, i.e. the first computer or the shared computer. Byte 122 seen in Figure 2B indicates an address of the sending card, i.e. an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the at least one terminal is connected. This formatting of data by CPU 80 to include the address of the sending card/connector to which the terminal is connected can be considered identification processing of data.

Beasley does not explicitly disclose the first computer/at least one first computer is a private computer/at least one private computer corresponding to the at least one

Art Unit: 2135

terminal. Beasley also does not disclose the identification processing enciphering a received key code via use of the identifier as an encryption key.

However, AAPA discloses a conventional, i.e. standard prior art, system and method where a private computer which corresponds to at least one terminal and a network computer is prepared for each user, where switch controls are used to switch between the user's use of the private computer that corresponds to at least one terminal and the network computer (specification: page 2, lines 2-31). In light of this, at the time applicant's invention was made, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Beasley's switching invention such that the first computer/at least one first computer disclosed by Beasley is a private computer/at least one private computer that corresponds to a specific at least one terminal. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because as disclosed by AAPA, such a setup where a user is able to switch between a private computer and another computer was typically used to allow the user to differentiate the user of the computers according to the contents and importance of the work (p2, lines 2-31). One skilled would also have been motivated to modify at least one first computer as taught by Beasley into a private computer which corresponds to a specific terminal because it would allow the user to work more efficiently since the user is not sharing the computer's resources with other users.

AAPA also does not disclose that the prior art taught the identification processing enciphering a received key code via use of the identifier as an encryption key.

However, Rothenberg discloses identification processing wherein a data frame to be sent from a source address to a destination address is enciphered via use of an

Art Unit: 2135

identifier, i.e. address, that corresponds to a source, i.e. connector through which a terminal is connected, as an encryption key (col 3, lines 37-57). In light of this, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify Beasley's invention such that in the identification processing performed by CPU 80, the key code as seen in Figure 2B such that it was enciphered via use of an identifier, i.e. address, corresponding to the connector to which the at least one terminal is connected, i.e. the source of the data transmission. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would provide for a secure way of transmitting data from a source to a destination address (Rothenberg: col 1, lines 28-30). In the case where a receiver accidentally receives a data packet which was not meant for the particular receiver, it would also prevent the receiver from gaining access to the packet which was accidentally received (Rothenberg: col 2, lines 25-31).

In light of the above discussion, it is obvious that the switching device as claimed in claim 1 is composed of elements previously well known in the art of networking and combined together in such a way that does no more than yield predictable results. Because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of Beasley, AAPA, and Rothenberg according to the limitations as recited in claim 1 for the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not patentable.

Claim 7 is directed towards a method performed using the switching device of claim 1 and is rejected for much the same reasons given in claim 1.

Claims 2 and 8:

As per claims 2 and 8, the limitation of any one private computer and a shared computer was obvious over Beasley and AAPA as discussed above. Data being received by the switching device and outputted from the switching device to any one private computer or to the shared computer is also obvious to Beasley and AAPA's teachings since Beasley discloses the data being received from a terminal by the switching device and outputted to the computers attached to the switching device (col 3, lines 2-16). As per AAPA's teachings these computers being private computers and shared computers are obvious (p2, lines 2-31).

Beasley and AAPA do not explicitly disclose an enciphering unit that executes an enciphering processing local to each terminal of data that has been transmitted from any one terminal and received by the switching device. Beasley and AAPA also do not explicitly disclose a first and second deciphering unit that executes a deciphering processing corresponding to the enciphering processing local to the at least one terminal...of data that has been outputted form the switching device.... However, Rothenberg discloses an enciphering unit, i.e. encryptor, that executes local processing local to each terminal of data that has been transmitted from any one terminal and received by the switching device and deciphering unit (col 3, lines 33-57 and Fig 3). Rothenberg discloses a deciphering unit, i.e. decryptor, that executes a deciphering processing corresponding to the enciphering processing local to the at least one terminal...of data that has been outputted form the switching device (col 3, lines 33-36 and Fig 4).

In light of the above teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify Beasley's invention according to the limitations further recited in claims 2 and 8. Note that in Figure 1 of Rothenberg, there are multiple encryptor/decryptor 12, thus it would have been obvious to have a first and second deciphering unit. One skilled would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Beasley, AAPA, and Rothenberg for the same reasons given in claims 1 and 7.

Claim 13:

Beasley discloses at least one first computer (Fig 1, item 52); at least one terminal corresponding to the at least one first computer (Fig 1, item 62); at least one shared computer connected to a network (Fig 1, item 54); and a switching device (Fig 1, item 60). The switching device as recited in claim 13 has limitations as recited for the switching device of claim 1. The rejection of the limitations of the switching device recited in claim 13 can be found in the rejection of claim 1. Note that in Figure 1 of Beasley, one can see that the switching device 60 is disposed between at least one first computer and the terminal, for relaying data between the terminal and the at least one shared computer.

Beasley does not disclose the at least one first computer being a private computer. However, as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, private computers corresponding to a terminal were well known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made as admitted by applicant, thus the limitation is obvious to the combination invention of Beasley, AAPA, and Rothenberg.

Claim 17:

Art Unit: 2135

As per claim 17, the limitations recited therein are a combination of the limitations recited in claims 13 and 2, which were discussed as being obvious to the combination invention of Beasley, AAPA, and Rothenberg.

Claims 14 and 18:

Beasley does not explicitly disclose wherein at least one shared computer is connected to a second network independent of said network. However, the examiner take official notice that computer systems and networks wherein at least one computer (shared or private) that is connected to a further/second network independent of said network have existed before the time applicant's invention was made. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to connect a shared computer to a further independent network as this would allow more access of information for the users Beasley's invention.

Claim 15 and 19:

Beasley does not explicitly disclose wherein the network is the Internet. However, the examiner take official notice that a network being the Internet, which is connected to a computer of any sort has been known to exist before the time applicant's invention was made. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to connect a shared computer to a further independent network where the network is the Internet because it would allow users of Beasley's invention to have access to one of the largest source of information on the planet.

Claim 16 and 20:

Beasley does not explicitly disclose wherein the second network is an intranet. However, the examiner takes official notice that a further/second network being an intranet has existed before the time applicant's invention was made. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to connect a shared computer to a further independent network as this would allow more access of information for the users of the Beasley's invention. Some of the information may be obtained only by being connected to an intranet, which contains restricted information.

Claim 38:

As per claim 38, Beasley discloses:

1. A connecting unit (Fig 1, item 60) connecting a terminal of a plurality of terminals (Fig 1, workstations 63-66) to a one of a plurality of first computer (Fig 1, computers A-C) and at any instance only one of the terminals may be connected to the network computer (Fig 1). Note that switch 60 shows that at any instance in time, only one terminal may be connected to any one shared, i.e. networked, computer at a time.
2. An identification processing unit (Fig 1, pod 70 or Fig 2, CPU 80) coupled to the connection unit (Fig 1) utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the terminal is connected (col 6, lines 42-54).

Beasley does not explicitly disclose each of the plurality of first computers are private computers. Beasley does not explicitly disclose each of the plurality of terminals

connects to only one corresponding private computer of the plurality of private computers or a network computer.

However, AAPA discloses that computers being private computers was well known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made (p2, lines 2-31). AAPA discloses that it was conventional, i.e. standard, in the art of switching to prepare a private computer and a network computer for each use such that each user could switch between the private computer and the network computer (p2, lines 2-31). In light of this, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Beasley's invention such each of the plurality of terminals seen in Figure 1 had a corresponding private computer to which only the corresponding private computer can connect and a network computer to which only one terminal can connect at any instance in time. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because AAPA discloses that it was conventional/standard for each user to have their own private computer and to be able to switch to a network computer as needed so as to differentiate between uses of the computers according to the content of the work (p2, lines 2-31). One skilled would have been motivated to have only one user be able to connect to the network computer at a time because if resources were shared between multiple users at the same time, the users would be working less efficiently than if he/she had exclusive access.

Beasley also does not disclose the identification processing unit enciphering a received key code via use of the identifier as an encryption key. However, as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, this limitation was disclosed by Rothenberg. At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2135.

the art to further modify Beasley's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 38. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate Rothenberg's teachings within Beasley's for the same reasons given in claim 1.

Claims 4, 10, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley et al (US 5,721,842) in view of applicant's admittance of prior art (herein referred to as AAPA) and further in view of Rothenberg (US 5,432,850) and further in view of Wilder et al (US 6,557,170).

Claims 4 and 10:

Beasley further discloses a switching unit that cancels a connection of the terminal when the terminal has been connected to the shared computer; switches the connection to first computer corresponding to the terminal, that cancels a connection of the terminal when the terminal has been connected to the first computer corresponding to the terminal (Fig 1, item 60 and col 10, lines 42-49). Note that the first computer being a private computer is obvious to the combination of Beasley, AAPA, and Rothenberg, as previously discussed.

Beasley does not explicitly disclose a detecting unit that detects whether or not a key code of a predetermined key transmitted from any terminal has been received in a predetermined number during a predetermined period of time. However, this limitation

Art Unit: 2135

reads on the use of hot keys. Hot keys are keys codes or combination of key codes that are detected in a predetermined number during a predetermined period of time and if detected, causes a predetermined action to occur. Wilder discloses this limitation (col 2, lines 19-49; col 5, lines 54-64; and col 6, lines 28-35).

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Beasley's invention according to the above limitations by incorporating use of hot keys. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because hot keys would allow a user to have short cuts in causing certain actions to occur with Beasley's switching device, which is convenient for the user.

Beasley also does not explicitly disclose the switching unit disregarding the connection switching request when a terminal other than a corresponding terminal has already been connected to the shared computer, at a time when the detecting unit has performed detecting. However, it was well known in the art to disregard a request to a connect to a device when the device is already busy or in use. At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to further modify Beasley's invention such that it disregarded connection switching requests when a terminal other than the corresponding terminal has already been connected to the shared computer, at a time when the detecting unit has performed detecting. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would ensure that only one person at a time is using a computer, which would enable a computer to function more efficiently since it does not have to share resources among multiple users.

Claim 25:

As per claim 25, the limitations recited therein are a combination of what is recited in claims 13, 1, and 4. Claim 25 is rejected for the same reasons given in claims 13, 1, and 4.

Claims 26-28:

Claims 26-28 recite limitations similar to what is recited in claims 14-16 respectively and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley et al (US 5,721,842) in view of applicant's admittance of prior art (herein referred to as AAPA) and further in view of Rothenberg (US 5,432,850) and further in view of Onsen (US 6,473,811).

Claims 5 and 11:

Beasley does not explicitly disclose a posing unit that posts a connection status of the shared computer to each terminal. However, Onsen discloses this limitation (col 1, lines 29-39). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify Beasley's invention according to the limitations recited in claims 5 and 11. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because incorporating a posting unit which displays a connection status into a switching device would allow users to see if the computer is already being used and thus the users would know not to waste time trying to connect to a busy computer.

Claims 6 and 12:

Onsen further discloses the posting unit posts to each terminal that the shared computer is currently being used, when the shared computer is currently being used (col 1, lines 29-39).

Claim 29:

As per claim 29, the limitations recited therein are similar to what is recited in claims 13, 1, and 5. Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons given in claims 13, 1, and 5.

Claims 30-32:

Claims 30-32 recite limitations similar to what is recited in claims 14-16 respectively and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 33:

As per claim 33, the limitations recited therein are similar to what is recited in claims 13, 1, and 6. Claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons given in claims 13, 1, and 6.

Claims 34-36:

Claims 34-36 recite limitations similar to what is recited in claims 14-16 respectively and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 3, 9, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley et al (US 5,721,842) in view of applicant's admittance of prior art (herein

Art Unit: 2135

referred to as AAPA) and further in view of Rothenberg (US 5,432,850) and further in view of Nichols (US 7,039,810).

Claims 3 and 9:

As per claims 3 and 9, most of the limitations recited therein have already been addressed in the rejections for claims 1-2 and 7-8. The following limitations were not explicitly disclosed by Beasley, AAPA, and Rothenberg, but are disclosed by Nichols:

1. Wherein the enciphering unit bit shifts the received data to a first direction between a highest bit and a lowest bit by a key value (col 3, lines 32-61).
2. The first deciphering unit bit shifts an output data to a second direction opposite to the first direction by a key value corresponding to the at least one private computer (col 3, lines 32-61).
3. The second deciphering unit bit shifts the output data to a second direction opposite to the first direction by a key value of a terminal currently connected to the shared computer (col 3, lines 32-61).

Essentially, the above recited limitations discuss enciphering and deciphering data by rotating the data in one direction to encipher and in the opposite direction to decipher. The amount to rotate is controlled by a number/value of each terminal, i.e. an enciphering/deciphering key associated with the terminal.

In the cited passages, Nichols discloses that the most commonly employed encryption method involves rotation of bits/bytes of the data stream. One skilled should appreciate that deciphering is the inverse operation of enciphering, thus if one were to

Art Unit: 2135

encipher by rotating bits a certain number of places, to decipher one must rotate in the opposite directed the same number of places. To know how much to rotate to decipher an enciphered data requires the use of a key which contains this information. The cited passage of Nichols also discloses the use of keys to encrypt and decrypt data. As previously discussed, use of a number/identifier/address which corresponds to the at least one terminal connected to either the private or shared computer as an encryption/decryption key was obvious to the combined teachings of Beasley, AAPA, and Rothenberg.

In light of the above, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Beasley's invention according to the limitations recited in claims 3 and 9. One skilled would have been motivated to encipher and decipher via bit shifting data because Nichols discloses it is the most commonly employed cryptographic method (col 3, lines 32-33).

Claim 21:

As per claim 21, the limitations recited there in are a combination of the limitations recited in claims 17 and 3. Claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons given in claims 17 and 3.

Claims 22-24:

The limitations further recited in claims 22-24 are similar to what is recited in claims 14-16 respectively and are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley et al (US 5,721,842) in view of Rothenberg (US 5,432,850).

Claim 37:

Beasley discloses:

3. A connection unit (Fig 1, item 60) connecting a terminal to a private computer or a share computer (col 2, lines 56-64).
4. An identification processing unit (Fig 1, pod 70 or Fig 2, CPU 80) coupled to the connection unit (Fig 1) utilizing an identifier corresponding to a connector through which the terminal is connected (col 6, lines 42-54).

Beasley does not disclose the identification processing enciphering a received key code via use of the identifier as an encryption key. However, as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, this limitation was disclosed by Rothenberg. At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Beasley's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 37. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate Rothenberg's teachings within Beasley's for the same reasons given in claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ponnoreay Pich whose telephone number is 571-272-7962. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-4:30pm Mon-Thurs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ponnoreay Pich
Examiner
Art Unit 2135



HOSUK SONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

PP